know therefore, after the publication of the S.R.C Report, what havoc this idea had done to this country and to its fair name. We therefore must think; if we have sense enough to think, we have to revert to the old order of things which ensured brotherly feeling and a happy atmosphere. It is more in the way of repentance—I do not hesitate to use that word—I have brought forward this Resolution in order to establish the past position that prevailed, the desirable position that prevailed when the States were multi-lingual or bi-lingual as the case may be.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has made up his mind. I am very sorry that he did not come with an open mind. Even now I would appeal to him. This has been a question discussed as a non-party question. From the very beginning we have discussed and we have dealt with this problem in that happy spirit. After the explanation I have given and after clearing my *bona fides* in the matter, I hope, my appeal will go to convince him and his friends to vote for this Resolution. That will be a very happy augury for us to work as members of the new Assembly that is to come into existence. I request that this Resolution may be accepted unanimously by this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> "That this Assembly is of opinion that in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bi-lingual States with regional Council for each linguistic area."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet at 3-55 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Four of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956.

Clauses—(contd.)

4 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now clause 15. There are amendments tabled by Sri Hutche Gowda. He is not here. Sri Rajasekhara Murthy is not moving his amendment. Sri K. Pattabhi Raman may move his amendment.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That clause 15 of Part III be deleted from the Bill."

Sir, I would suggest, if you are agreeable, to move a more appropriate amendment suggesting the deletion of clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18 and all the clauses of Part III may be taken together and as regards putting them to vote, I will leave it to you. If you will permit me I shall modify the amendment to this extent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Therefore, "I move That all these clauses 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of Part III may be deleted."

Sir, even when I was making my general remarks on the Bill, I have indicated the reasons why I particularly chose to request this House to delete Part III entirely. I feel, Sir, the suggested appointment of Zonal Councils does not serve any useful purpose at all. In fact, one has merely to see the Constitution of the proposed Zonal Councils, in order to find out how far it will have any effective voice in shaping either the policy or the programme of the future States to be. Each Zonal Council, especially with reference to certain States in the South, has got a fixed representation as it were. The Chief Minister accompanied by two Ministers—who are certainly responsible to him and own joint responsibility with him—and then the Chief Secretary and the Development Commissioner—who are public functionaries working under the Government of the time, go there. Therefore,

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

it will not certainly be right because all these five persons who come to represent in number a State neither could resolve any conflict nor serve any useful purpose by making any particular contribution. The Chief Minister will go accompanied by these Ministers and officers who cannot certainly differ from him. The result is that the Chief Minister for the time being accompanied by four advisers who cannot differ from him will go and sit in the Zonal Council. To this extent, it will only be a costly process; it will mean some more lakhs of rupees to the exchequer to be shared by all the States in the region which are going to be comprised in the Zonal Council to be. Even apart from that, it is to be only an advisory body in the sense that its decisions are not binding on anybody even perhaps not by those who make the suggestions. It is not invested with any particular power or responsibility which it is competent to discharge. And further, Sir, you will kindly see, suppose we take away from the Bill, this particular part III in its entirety, what happens? I would like the House to consider that even if this part is taken away from the Bill, the rest of the Bill will still be intact and there will be nothing wanting and the retention of Part III does not make the Bill any more valuable. My suggestion to this House is therefore that these Zonal Councils would be a costly process serving no definite purpose. If I may be permitted to recall with pleasure some remarks made by the Hon'ble Leader of the House on another occasion, he was the first to express the opinion that the Zonal Councils as are now proposed to be constituted, would serve no good purpose and that unless their powers are increased and unless they are given some definite statutory and constitutional functions and powers and responsibilities to discharge, he himself felt that the Zonal Councils would be illusory bodies and would be merely costly appendages. In fact, Sir, on this occasion, it gives me some amount of personal satisfaction to recollect what that great statesman Sri C. Rajagopalachari said speaking on this Bill in the Legislative Council, as reported in the press yesterday. He has made a pointed reference to the Zonal Councils and in a way it reflects the opinion that I have tried to canvass even while I was speaking on the Bill, namely, that the Zonal Councils as they are proposed to be constituted, would not serve any good purpose. Therefore, I am making this suggestion to delete the provisions relating to the Zonal Councils. But if the intention of the framers of this Bill was to arrest and control the centrifugal tendencies inherent in the set-up of separate unilingual States and the bitterness that such a situation might engender and to develop a sort of common citizenship and the idea of common nationhood, one has merely to see whether clause 15 and the succeeding clauses in Part III will serve that laudable object and whether the object as conceived by the framers of the Bill is really subserved to any extent.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Have you given any alternatives?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have suggested clause 122 to be added at the end. In fact, I would like to go further and say that the most important thing, namely, the soul is lacking in the present proposal in the body of the Zonal Councils and I have tried in my own humble way to put in the soul into this body of Zonal Council so that you will have a full and fruitfull personality which will enable the South Indian States to grow to their full stature.

I do not see any reason why I should try to canvass support for my view as expressed in this amendment, particularly when the Hon'ble Leader of the House himself has expressed that view and still holds that view. Even the other Hon'ble Members and more particularly my Hon'ble friend Sri Imam have expressed views very much similar to that view and they have felt in the same way though they would not have gone to the extent to which I would have liked them to go. Nevertehless there was a feeling that there was dissatisfication with the composition and assigned powers of the Zonal Councils as they

are proposed in the Bill under discussion.

Therefore, I commend the amendment to the House, with this rider that, if unfortunately it happend that the Government and the ruling party is not willing to accept this amendment but would like the Bill to go through the anvil of this House in the form in which it is presented, I shall only express my helplessness. But nevertheless, I shall comfort myself with the feeling that they were helpful with me to putting the soul into the body, which today it was lacking.

With these words, I commend the amendment for the kind acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

> " That clauses 15 to 21 of Part III be deleted".

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I fully endorse the various reasons given by my learned friend Sri K. Pattabhiraman who has advocated in his own inimitable way the abolition of the proposed Zonal Councils. I need not repeat the arguments which he has advanced and I fully agree with him. These Zonal Councils as he said will not serve any purpose either to bring together all the various States that come under the zone or to improve the harmony or to remove the misunderstandings that may arise as between one State and the other. On the other hand, there is every possibility that these Zonal Councils may accenutate differences, may bring in disharmony and may even lead to friction. My own view, Sir, is this. I think it is said that the Central Government has sponsored this idea with a view to bring together the various States having different views or holding different ideas. My own view is that it aims at giving more power to the Centre. It is a wellknown fact that the Central Government is interested in curtailing the powers of the States as much as possible and always aim at more and more centralisation and to grant as much power as possible to themselves. I think that it is with this view that the Zonal Councils have been incorporated in the Bill. Sir, it is also said that the Minister of the Union shall be the Chairman of the Zonal Council. Secondly, Sir, it is also said that whenever there are differnces of opinion, it is the Central Government that will decide the matter. Sir, if you consider the composition of the Council you may imagine that no harmonious decision will be arrived at when there are conflicting interests. The various functions entrusted to the Zonal Council are these : It must be noted that the business of the Zonal Council is to make recommendations in regard to :

> "(*a*) any matter connected with, or arising out of, the reorganisation of the States under this Act, such as border disputes, linguistic minorities and inter-State transport ;
>
> (*b*) any matters concerning economic planning ; and
>
> (*c*) all matter of common interest and benefit to the people in the field of social planning."

In the first place, the Zonal Council is expected to make recommendations only. Even if it takes unanimous decisions, it is subject to the approval of the Central Government. The Zonal Council has no powers at all. Whatever it says or does' is always subject to the control of the Central Government. Even if you think of the subjects that can possibly be discussed in the Zonal Council, I think ninety cases out of a hundred will always be differing in decisions. For example, take the border disputes. When various representatives from various States meet on a matter like border disputes, it is rare that they will ever come to an understanding. For example, recently there was a meeting between the representatives of Madras and Mysore regarding the position which Hosur should occupy. They wanted to come to an understanding between themselves. But in spite of various meetings, both these Governments could not come to a definite conclusion. Similarly other disputes also. It is quite certain and it can safely be presumed that the Governments meeting in Zonal Council will never be able to come to an

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

understanding. Inevitably, every matter will have to go up to the Union Minister of the Central Government who presides and who will have a dominating voice. So the Zonal Council is nothing but an attempt on the part of the Central Government to assume more powers and curtail the powers of the State Governments. Sir, a time has come when we must cry a halt to this race of assuming all powers by the Centre. I must say the Centre has been very avaricious. They want to make all the States powerless. These Zonal Councils are nothing but to curtail the powers of the States. Therefore, I oppose this section and I agree with my friend Sri Pattabhiraman to delete this section.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ಪುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ನಾವು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪೊಟಕು ಮಾಡ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪುವು ದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದು ಹಿಂದೆ ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟ ರಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಅತಿಥಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಹುದೆ ಕೂಡದೆ ಎಂದು ಇಕ್ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡ ಆಗ ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಈ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಆದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಅವರನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅವರ ಅರ್ಹತೆಯೇನು, ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೇನು ಎಂದೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಎಕ್ಸಿಕ್ಯುಟಿವ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಂಥ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರ ರಾಗಿದೆ. ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಲಿಸ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏಳನೆಯ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲಿ ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಡಿಫೆನ್ಸ್, ಫಾರಿನ್ ಅಫೇರ್ಸ್, ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿ ಕೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಮೂರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಾಕಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಆಗ ಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಬೇಡ.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavanagudi).—The only reason why I rise to speak on this occasion is to explain the position which I took when I adduced some arguments in support of the recommendations of the Report of the S.R.C. Sir, then, it was urged that on the basis of linguistic provinces, those districts of Bombay Presidency which were anaxious to join Mysore should be allowed to join

Sir, this Part III in the Bill is a very important chapter and the clauses throw new light on the reorganisation of the States. This Assembly assumed the position in the last session that on the linguistic principle, those districts desirous of joining Mysore may be allowed to do so. But, the States Re-organisation Commission's recommendations are not based purely on lingistic principle. It cannot also be said that those recommendations did not emphasise the linguistic principle. Wherever it was convenient, they adopted the linguistic principle and wherever they thought that this would go against the interest of the country, they recommended bi-lingual and tri-lingual States. Sir, the House is aware that the Commission recommended in the case of Mysore, a State based on linguistic principle; but, in the case of Bombay they recommended a bi-lingual State. Therefore, it cannot be said that in the formation of States they have followed one principle.

Sir, when the Report of the S.R.C. was discussed and the resolution passed, as the Chief Minister has said, it was not in a very clear atmosphere that we passed the resolution. There was some difference of opinion and there was dissatisfaction among a section of the people. But, after seeing the havoc in Bombay, in Orissa and in Belgaum, it was but right for all to listen to the advice of the leaders of the country. We have not done anything wrong in doing so. This House has taken a comprehensive view of the whole position. In that set up, it is very necessary that we consider this clause about the Zonal Council.

Sir, as the House is aware, a few days before the Session of the Amritsar Congress, Pandit Nehru introduced this idea of Dakshina Pradesh. I was one of those who said that this idea was a good idea and worth pursuing. I am very happy that Mysore has been leading South India in this matter. We have followed the debates of the Madras Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER.—The amendment is under discussion. Hon'ble Member may confine his remarks to the amendment.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—Sir, these Zonal Councils are the precursors of the bi-lingual or tri-lingual States. The Zonal Council in the South is for Mysore, Madras, Andhra and Travancore-Cochin. The idea of having a provision for the Zonal

Council in the Bill is to see that there is unity and a sort of understanding in South India. I wholeheartedly support this clause. Sir, the Leader of this House has played a glorious part in the reshaping of our country. With all the difficulties that he had to face in coming to this opinion, he has done a very noble thing. He has shown a way to South India. Even in Madras, if we could read the speeches of Sri C. Rajagopalachari and Sri C. Subrahmaniam, they have individually said: 'Left to me, I would sponsor the State called Dakshina Pradesh'. Sir, Mysore has shown the way and if it were possible to join other States, Mysore would be the first. I congratulate the House and the Leader of the House for the noble part played in giving a new shape and a new light to this idea.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, a very interesting discussion has taken place on this Zonal Council issue. I am tempted to agree with the observations made by the Hon'ble Members. The Zonal Councils now proposed do not seem to command the amount of approval that is necessary for them. So, Sir, I propose that this Chapter may be taken into consideration tomorrow. In the meanwhile, we shall bestow our thoughts on it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the amendment of Sri R. Anantaraman to Clause 22.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That in sub-clause (6)
>
> (1) after the words "the State of Bombay" the word "and" shall be omitted.
>
> (2) after the words "the State of Hyderabad" the following words shall be added, namely:—
>
> "and such one member out of eighteen sitting members representing the State of Madras."
>
> (3) for the word 'ten' in the last line, the word 'eleven' shall be substituted."

ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಿರುವ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಆಫ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲೂ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಆದರೆ ಮದರಾಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿರುವುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

4-30 P.M.

As amended, sub-clause (6) of Clause 22 would read as follows:

> "The six sitting members representing the State of Mysore and such two of the seventeen sitting members representing the State of Bombay, such two of the eleven sitting members representing the State of Hyderabad and such one member out of the eighteen sitting members representing the State of Madras, as the Chairman shall by order specify, shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been duly elected to fill eleven of the twelve seats allotted to the new State of Mysore."

ಇಲ್ಲಿ 'an l' ಎಂಬ ಪದ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಆಕರ್ಷಿಟ್ ಪಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೀಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

> "That in sub-clause (6)
>
> (1) after the words "the State of Bombay" the word "and" shall be omitted.
>
> (2) after the words "the State of Hyderabad" the following words shall be added, namely:—
>
> 'and such one member out of the eighteen sitting members representing the State of Madras.'
>
> (3) for the word 'ten' in the last line, the word 'eleven' shall be substituted."

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅವರೇನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅನಂತರ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿರಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರಲಿ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಅನಂತರಾಮ್.—ಮದರಾಸಿನವರು ಏನೂಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಿನ್ನೆದಿವಸ ತಾನೆ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದುಬಂತು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸಾಧು ವಾದದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"In sub-clause (6)—

(1) after the words 'the State of Bombay' the word 'and' shall be omitted.

(2) after the words 'the State of Hyderabad' the following words shall be added, namely:—

'And such one member out of the eighteen sitting members representing the State of Madras.'

(3) for the word 'ten' in the last line, the word 'eleven' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next Clause.

***Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY** (Chitaldrug).—I want to oppose all these three clauses with regard to the Council of States. It is not that I do not want the Council of States. It is necessary that there should be a Council of States for a big country like India. A revising Chamber at the Centre under a federal structure of Government is absolutely necessary. But what I am objecting to is that the representation of States in the Council of States should not be on the basis of population but should be on the basis of equality. Though I concede that there is need to have representation for the States in the House of the People on the basis of the population strength, in the Council of States it is absolutely necessary that all the States federating into the Indian Union should have equal representation, for States which have got high population strengths will have greater representation in the House of the People, and they will have larger representation in the Council of States so much so whatever decisions have been taken by the House of the People will not be revised or rectified by the Council of States because the same members that are represented in the Council of States will reflect the political parties of the different States. And it is quite possible that bigger States, because of their strength in the House of the People and in the Council of States, will try to dictate terms to the other States and therefore it is absolutely necessary that the representation of the States in the Council of States should be on the basis of equality.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next, Clause 26. The Leader of the House will move an amendment to Clause 26.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I move:

"(1) In sub-clause (1) after the words 'becomes part of a new State', the words, brackets, figure and letter ' then, save as provided in sub-section (2A) ' shall be inserted.

(2) After sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely:—

"(2A) The members of the Legislative Assembly of Coorg shall, as soon as may be, after the commencement of this Act, elect three persons from among themselves in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote and in such manner as may be prescribed; and the persons so elected shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been elected to the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore by a constituency comprising the whole of Coorg District."

The Coorg Assembly which has now 24 members is sought to be bodily incorporated into the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore. On the basis of population, that State is entitled to only 2½ members or so. If the principle of representation that prevails in Mysore State is applied to that State also, we have to make provision for three members. We cannot have 2½ members nor is it fair for us to reduce their number even by half. So by way of a generous gesture we have made the number o members from Coorg to be three in the new Assembly. In the Bill they have made provision

for 24 members. This is unduly disproportionate. For an area which is about a taluk and a half of Mysore State or any part of the new areas that are coming into the Mysore State, to allot 24 seats would upset administrative and political balance. In the interim period we have to take many decisions. To give disproportionate weightage to a particular taluk or taluks would not be in consonance with fair play and justice so far as representation in the Assembly is concerned. I am sure the Government of India will take note of the opinion of this House. I am sure the Hon'ble Members from Coorg also will see that it will not be fair for them to expect all of them to come into this Assembly. (SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—*The same treatment as has been given to Cutch.*) The same treatment as has been given to Cutch in the Bill and therefore we are incorporating the same idea that the Bill incorporates with reference to Cutch State. I suppose there is no difference of opinion with regard to this amendment and it may be accepted unanimously.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—A clarification. Is there any constitutional objection? Because under the Constitution when a member is elected once he has a right to continue for five years till the next election. I do not know if there is any constitutional objection.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—How can there be a constitutional objection? Under the Constitution 'C' States were brought into existence. When the State itself disappears what about the membership?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The State does not disappear. The State is merged and along with it, the members also are transferred. I think they have a right to continue as members, under the Constitution and even the Central Government have no power to terminate their membership.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—There must be a modification. For example, the Chief Minister of Coorg cannot continue as Chief Minister here. The Speaker of Coorg cannot continue as Speaker here. The Deputy Speaker of Coorg cannot continue here. Therefore, we have to modify the set-up of Coorg so as to suit the set-up of the new State. There will be increased expenditure also. It is not as though members come and sit. We have to pay 24 members' salaries and allowances and arrange for accommodation for all these people. There is also the administrative difficulty. The very Hon'ble Members who complain about unnecessary expenditure will see that it is not advisable to pay 24 members' salaries and allowances for any length of time. It may be six months or eight months. Therefore, I want that this amendment may be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

> (1) In sub-clause (1), after the words "becomes part of a new State", the words, brackets, figure and letter "then, save as provided in sub-section (2A)" shall be inserted.
>
> (2) After sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely :—
>
> "(2A) The members of the Legislative Assembly of Coorg shall, as soon as may be, after the commencement of this Act, elect three persons from among themselves in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote and in such manner as may be prescribed; and the persons so elected shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been elected to the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore by a constituency comprising the whole of Coorg district."

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದು ಒಕ್ಕೂಟದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದದ್ದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗಳಾದರೋ ಕೇವಲ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲದ ವರೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರತಕ್ಕವುಗಳು. ಪುನಃ ಜನರಲ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ)

ಅವಧಿ ಪೂರೈಸುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರಿನೊಂದಿಗೆ ಸೇರಲು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಐದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಒಂದು ಸಮನಾದ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯಾ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ 75 ಸಾವಿರ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ 40 ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೊಬ್ಬರಂತೆ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ 1 ಲಕ್ಷ 20 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೊಬ್ಬರಂತೆ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳಿಂದ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕವರೆಲ್ಲ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ತರಹೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದರಲ್ಲೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆಯೋ ಆ ಸಿತಿಯೇ ಮುಂದಿನ ಜನರಲ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬರುವತನಕ ಮುಂದುವರಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಸಹೃದಯ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬರಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಇನ್ನು ಕೊಡಗು ಮತ್ತು ಅಜ್ಮೀರಗಳೆರಡಕ್ಕೂ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಸೀಟನ್ನು ಆ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಆಫ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ರೊಟೇಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ 2½ ಲಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೊಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನಾವೀಗ ಈ ಕೊಡಗಿಗೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಪುನಃ ಮದರಾಸ್, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕವರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದೀತು. ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಅನಾಮಲಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೂ 6 ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲವಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಲಾರದು. ನಮಗೀಗ ಪ್ರಾವಿಜ್ ಇರುವುದು 182 ಜನರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ. ಆದರೆ 8-10 ಜನ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಂದು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಂದು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಂಬಳದ ಖರ್ಚು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇಂಥ ತತ್ವವನ್ನೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಆಚರಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು 6 ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ನಾವೇನೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಂಥ ದುಬಾರಿ ಖರ್ಚೇನೂ ಆಗಲಾರದು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಸಹೃದಯ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅತಿ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I agree with Sri Hutche Gowda. We have got to suffer this imbalance for some time and put up with the inconveniences that may have to occur. I agree entirely with Sri Hutche Gowda that we are not going to give equal representation to all the areas that are coming into Mysore. If you compare the analogy that was placed before us by the Chief Minister, the number of members from the existing Mysore in the new Assembly will have been inflated to some extent and the constituencies in Mysore are much smaller than the constituencies in Bombay or Hyderabad. I therefore agree with the opposition held out by Sri Hutche Gowda.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ (ಮದ್ದೂರು).—ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್, ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗತಾನೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದವರು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್, ಮದರಾಸ್ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಸಿದ್ದರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇರಬಹುದು, ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ 1 ಲಕ್ಷ 20 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿರಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ 1 ಲಕ್ಷ 40 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೊಬ್ಬರಂತೆ ಆರಿಸಿ ಬಂದಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ 2½ ಲಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜಾಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ 24 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇರುವುದೆಂದರೇನಾಯಿತು? ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ತಾರತಮ್ಯ ಇರಬೇಡವೇ? 2½ ಲಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ 24 ಜನರು ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ತೀರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಯಿತು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಾವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು. ಈ ಇಂಟೆರಿಂ ಪೀರಿಯಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಂದುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರು ಆದಳಿತದ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಲೆಕೆಳಗು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮೂರು ಜನರಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

"Clause 26.—(1) In sub-clause (1), after the words, 'becomes part of a new State', the words, brackets, figure and letter 'then, save as provided in sub-section (2A)' shall be inserted.

(2) After sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely—

'(2A) The members of the Legislative Assembly of Coorg shall, as soon as may be, after the commencement of this Act, elect three persons from among themselves in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote and in such manner as may be prescribed; and the persons so elected shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been elected to the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore by a constituency

comprising the whole of Coorg district'.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 33.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Before going to that clause I wish to speak on clause 27. I oppose that clause. I will read it. It is as follows.—

> "When a general election is next held. . . ."

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection if you simply say that you object to that clause. There is no time for you to make a speech. We simply note your objection.

***Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.**—The clause reads as follows :—

> "When a general election is next held in the State of Andhra-Telengana for electing members to the House of the People, elections shall also be held to fill the seats allotted to the Assembly constituencies into which the transferred territory in the State is divided in the order referred to in sub-section (2) of section 44, as if those seats had become vacant; and as from the date appointed under the Representation of the People Act, 1951 as the date before which the said elections shall be completed, all the persons who, having been sitting members of the Legislative Assembly of Hyderabad, become on the appointed day members of the Legislative Assembly of Andhra-Telengana under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) of section 26 of this Act shall cease to be such members."

In the explanatory note they have said that elections to the present Andhra Assembly were held in 1954.

> "Clause 28 fixes the duration of the provisional Assemblies of the new States and of the continuing Assemblies of Andhra and Madras. It will be recalled that the existing Assemblies of Travancore-Cochin, PEPSU and Andhra have been recently elected and in their case the normal period of five years began on 21st March 1954, 26th March 1954 and 21st April 1955 respectively . . . . . The position will be different in Andhra. The representation of the Telengana area in the enlarged Legislative Assembly of Andhra will be on the same population basis—roughly one representative for one lakh—as the representation of the present Andhra area. The number of sitting members of the Hyderabad Assembly who will become members of the Andhra Assembly on the appointed day will be only a little more than half the number of the members of the existing Andhra Assembly. Taking all these factors into consideration, it is proposed in clause 28(2) that the change in the composition of the Legislative Assembly of Andhra shall not affect its normal duration of five years from 21st April 1955, but a special provision is made in section 27 for holding a semi-general election in the Telengana area simultaneously with the next general election to the House of the People in that area."

It is true that elections were held for the Andhra Assembly on 21st April 1955. When a new State is going to be formed after 1st October 1956 the sitting members of the Andhra Assembly and the sitting members of the Telengana part of the Hyderabad Assembly are going to form the new Assembly. The general elections are going to take place in the beginning of 1957. There is a provision here that elections to that part of the area in Hyderabad which is going to be merged in the new Andhra State will be held along with the elections to the House of the People. But elections in the Andhra, in the new State area, are not going to be held and the present members will continue till 21st April 1960 or 61. This is really undemocratic. When a new State is going to be formed you cannot hold elections for a certain area only and say that in respect of other areas the existing members should

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

continue for some time to come. It is inevitable that elections for all constituencies in a particular State should be held at a particular time. And there should not be any spacing. It looks as though the Congress wants to continue its rule in the new Andhra State for another period of five years. They know full well that they would not have succeeded. . . .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I may state that a long speech on this clause which does not pertain to our business is unnecessary. It is more by way of courtesy that the Chair has allowed the Hon'ble Member to state his views on the position. I cannot speak for the Andhra Government here and what is the fun of the Hon'ble member making a speech here? It is one-sided.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I drew the attention of the Hon'ble Member that he can only protest because there is nobody here to answer.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I cannot expect any speech from the Chief Minister or the Andhra Government. It is the Central Government that is sponsoring this Bill. Let the Central Government know what the mind of persons here is. We do not want that the Congress rule should continue. It is most unfair, undemocratic and reactionary that such a measure should have been adumbrated in this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 33. Next amendment.

***Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T.-Narasipur).—Sir, I move my amendment to clause 33:

> "In sub-clause (1), between the words 'shall' and 'be' the word 'not' shall be inserted."

"Sub-clause (2), shall be deleted."

Clause 33, sub-clause (1) reads as follows:—

> "As from the appointed day there shall be a Legislative Council for the new State of Mysore."

The amended clause will read as follows.—

> "As from the appointed day there shall not be a Legislative Council for the new State of Mysore."

I have given notice of further amendments also to delete sub-clauses (3) and (4), I do not take much time of this House. It was on 8th October 1881 that in Mysore by a Royal Proclamation the Representative Assembly came into existence. Mysore had a unicameral Legislature till 1907. It is only in 1907 they brought into existence a Legislative Council purely for the purpose of consultation on legal matters, *i.e.*, legislative measures. By 1920 or 1922 by another Proclamation the right to discuss the Budget and to ask for information was conceded to the Legislative Council. By 1940 further powers were given to this Council.

As it is, the Legislative Assembly is exercising all the powers and discharging all the duties entrusted to the old Legislative Council. Now, as it is, the Legislative Council is purely an ornament. It is the Legislative Assembly that debates on the Budget and has the power to give notice of cut motions on demands for grants. The Legislative Council has no such powers now. It can only discuss the Budget. Even on legislative matters, concerning finance and other things, the Bill has to be introduced in this House. Therefore the purpose for which the Legislative Council was set up in the State of Mysore is no longer there. Suppose we do away with the Legislative Council, we will save about Rs. 2 lakhs and the question of accommodation and other things that the Chief Minister was mentioning would be easier. There must be some purpose and the purpose previously was to consult on legislative measures and also to debate on the Budget and send cut motions. All these things are being done now by the Legislative Assembly. And there is no vested interest in the Mysore State for which representation is necessary. In England the House of Lords is there because of

vested interests, the interest of land holders and the interests of some other institutions. But here there is nothing of that kind. This is an elected body; a sovereign body; it has power to debate on the Budget; it can send notice of cut motions—all these are the functions of this House. Then, where is the need for the continuance of the Upper House?

Suppose I do not move this amendment now. Under Article 169 of the Constitution, I think, a special resolution of this House is necessary to abolish the Legislative Council. So I say that this is the most appropriate time to introduce this small change and thereby do away with the Legislative Council.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.—

> "In sub-clause (1), between the words 'shall' and 'be' the word 'not' be inserted."
>
> "Sub-clause (2), shall be deleted."

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—I beg to move the following amendment.

> "For sub-clause (1) the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—
>
> '(1) As from the appointed day but only until the next General Elections to the Legislative Assembly, there shall be a Legislative Council for the new State of Mysore."

Should I move the other amendments also, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can also move the next one.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I move the next amendment also.

> "For sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—
>
> (2) until the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore has been duly re-constituted and summoned to meet for the first time thereafter, the said Council shall consist of—
>
> (*a*) All the sitting members of the Legislative Council of the existing State of Mysore;
>
> (*b*) all the sitting members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Madras and Bombay as have been elected to represent the Constituencies within the area or areas as have been transferred to the new State of Mysore; and
>
> (*c*) such other number of members to represent the territories not represented as before but comprised in the new State of Mysore in such manner as may be prescribed."
>
> Sub-clauses (3) and (4) shall be deleted."

So far as Sri Srinivasa Iyengar's general observations are concerned, they are of very great importance and I am sure they will have the approval of the House. But I have made a slight alteration. I felt that to suggest that on the appointed day, namely, 1st October 1956 the Legislative Council of Mysore should go, would not be a very fair way of dealing with a very important matter. Therefore I thought and have merely made a happy compromise between the two views as it were. I have suggested that the present Legislative Council with such additions as we may have in the course of the next month might continue until the General Elections are over, and as part of one Legislature even as we began five years ago. That is also in accordance with the spirit of a resolution of this House. I understand that my friend

5 P.M.

Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy once before had brought forward a resolution before this House to the effect that the Legislative Council shall be abolished. As against that proposition, we made the suggestion, on that occasion, that the Legislative Council may be allowed to continue as long as the present Assembly continued and when the General Elections were held, this change may be effected. The present clause also may be treated in a similar manner. I have fully advanced my views and observations while speaking on the Bill. I also say that such additions to number as may be neces-

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

sary may be made to the Assembly in order to give adequate representation to the several areas, and the membership of the Assembly may be suitably enhanced. I have also made an amendment to that effect which will come before the House in due course. Subject to that, I say the Council may be continued till the General Elections; it need not be a permanent body as is sought to be made out in this Bill. Sri Srinivasa Iyengar might also give precedence to mine and I personally feel that my amendment may have better chances of acceptance in this House. As we began together, we will continue together and together we face the General Elections also. I oppose the idea of a Legislative Council being a permanent body. I generally accept the arguments, weighty and enlightened, which have been advanced by my very good friend form T.-Narasipur. I request that this amendment may kindly be accepted by this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments moved:

'For sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

"(1) As from the appointed day but only until the next General Elections to the Legislative Assembly, there shall be a Legislative Council for the new State of Mysore."

"For sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

"(2) until the Legislative Assembly of the new State of Mysore has been duly reconstituted and summoned to meet for the first time thereafter, the said Council shall consist of:

(*a*) All the sitting members of the Legislative Council of existing State of Mysore;

(*b*) all the sitting members of the Legislative Councils of the existing States of Madras and Bombay as have been elected to represent the Constituencies within the area or areas as have been transferred to the new State of Mysore; and

(*c*) such other number of members to represent the territories not represented as before but comprised in the new State of Mysore in such manner as may be prescribed."

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗಿನ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಒಂದು ಭಾರವೆಂದು ಕಾಣಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಟಿವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟೀವ್ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಪಾಗಿ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೆಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರವೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೆಟಿವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೆಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಒಂದು superfluous body. ಇದೂ ಅಲ್ಲನೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ 7 ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು 8 ಅಥವಾ 9 ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈಗಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ territorial basis ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕು, ನಾಮಕರಣ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಆ ನಭೆಯಿಂದ ಎಳ್ಳಷ್ಟೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಎರಡು ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕಾಲಹರಣವಾಗುವುದು, ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಆ ಸಭೆಗಾಗಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಖರ್ಚು ಕೂಡ ತಪ್ಪುವುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

***Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.**—I support the amendment tabled by Sri Pattabhiraman and others. Sir, I am glad that the idea that the Legislative Council in Mysore should be abolished is gaining ground among the Members of this Assembly. When we are launching upon the new State, there seems to be no reason why this institution which does not serve any useful purpose and which only costs the exchequer to the extent of three or four lakhs should find a place. For some Part A States, even now there are no Legislative Councils. I therefore feel that it is better that all the States under the re-organisation scheme, should have only unicameral legislatures and the Legislative Councils may be abolished. We know that it is more for the misuse that these Councils are there and more for bringing in

people who are otherwise not in a position to get into the Legislative Assemblies, that these Councils are constituted and continued. I very vehemently oppose the continuance of the Legislative Council under the new set-up.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, since allegations have been made that the Ministry is likely to misuse the members of the Legislative Council, it has become almost impossible for me to accept the amendment. Hon'ble Members were asked to argue constitutional questions dispassionately. Many a time, they spoil their case by bad arguments. I wish they continue this tradition of bad arguments so that the Congress may be always in power. (*Laughter.*)

Sir, the question of Congress or Congress Ministry is not the issue now. Therefore, it would not be necessary for me to put forth any arguments in its support. Sir, this idea of whether or not the Legislative Council should be there is a debatable question. Honest differences can exist in regard to its existence. For the present, it is better that we continue the constitutional set-up as it is in Mysore to-day. To think of its abolition would be doing something which is very hasty. Sir, the Legislative Assembly has, under the Constitution, power to abolish the Legislative Council. Therefore, it is far better that we leave this matter to the Legislative Assembly that is to be elected after the General Elections. Some of our friends are very fond of arguing that people must be consulted. So, my friend Sri B. Hutche Gowda and Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy can go to the country on that basis, get the verdict and if at all they come back, they can vote against the existence of the Council in that new Assembly. Therefore, I want to give them a fair chance . . . .

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am sorry ; it is not the Chief Minister that gives a fair chance, but it is the constituency to both me and him.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I am unable to accept this amendment which is against the Constitution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'ble Member propose to do with his amendment ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I press it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in sub-clause (1), between the words 'shall' and 'be' the word 'not' shall be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the amendment of Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri Hutche Gowda.

The question is :

"That for sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :

(1) As from the appointed day but only until the next General elections to the Legislative Assembly there shall be a Legislative Council for the new State of Mysore."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put to vote Sri Srinivasa Iyengar's amendment. The question is :

"Sub-clause (2) shall be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—We may stop the proceedings at that. I will have to study Sri K. Pattabhiraman's amendments also. My amendments and his amendments go together. They may be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All right. To-morrow, for the first hour after question time, the special resolution about the Cultural Development movement will be taken up and afterwards, amendments to the States Re-organisation Bill.

The House will now rise for the day and meet at 12 of the Clock to-morrow.

The House adjourned at Twelve Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Thursday, 5th April 1956.

WD 2896—GPB—550—2-8-56